IEA CRP Evaluation of Livestock & Fish – Consortium Management Response

Purpose:

This document annexes the proposed Consortium Management response to the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA)) evaluation of the Livestock & Fish (L&F) CGIAR Research Program (CRP), presented as Annex 1 of this document. The document presents two additional annexes for reference:

- Annex 2: Executive Summary of the IEA evaluation
- Annex 3: CRP Management Response

1. The evaluation was commissioned according to Section 23 of the CGIAR Consortium-Fund Council Joint Agreement.¹

2. The management response has been prepared in line with the Consortium Office’s standing processes for review of IEA final evaluation reports.

¹ The April 15, 2011 agreement entered into between Bioversity International (on behalf of CGIAR before establishment) and the Fund Council (as represented by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), and approved by the Fund Council on April 5, 2011 and the Consortium Board on May 5, 2011.
Consortium Management Response to the External Review of CRP Livestock and Fish

The Consortium appreciates the CGIAR-IEA (2016) Evaluation of CGIAR Research Program on Livestock and Fish (L&F) and concurs with the major recommendations of the panel (as they appear in the Executive Summary and Chapter 8 of Volume 1 of the report). The evaluation essentially covers phase I of the CRP (since January 2012) and part of the extension phase in 2015 (since field visits and analysis continued by the panel from April to September 2015).

All recommendations are specific to the CRP and the Lead Center; the Consortium agrees with these recommendations.

The Recommendations of the Evaluation

**Recommendation 1: Capitalize on the benefits of being a CRP**

*Consortium response:* Agreed. This is a call for the CRP to act more as an entity, including in its presentations to donors and international forum debates on livestock, poverty and development, rather than representation being made by the individual Centers (ILRI, CIAT, ICARDA and WorldFish). This is a recommendation of importance to this CRP in its continuation and more generally to emerging CRPs in phase II.

**Recommendation 2: Increase synergies between livestock and aquaculture**

*Consortium response:* Agreed. The evaluation reports that this did not happen adequately in phase I with livestock and fish components being conducted essentially separately. However, the CO has encouraged interactions between the two fields where it makes sense to do so e.g. assistance to the start up of molecular genetic approaches to aquaculture breed improvement, in aspects of feeds research, in value chain research for animal source foods, food safety and nutrition. Even if Livestock and Fish CRPs are pursued separately in phase II (1917 on) it will be important to create synergies in these sorts of domains. Whilst ecosystem research will obviously be largely different, both CRPs, and Fish CRP in particular with relatively sparse CGIAR linkages otherwise, should take advantage of such inter-program collaboration. It is needed by both CRPs to create critical mass in value chain syntheses and learnings (also a finding of the evaluation).

**Recommendation 3: Streamline the portfolio**

*Consortium response:* Agreed. This principally refers to the number of value chains being addressed by the program. Even if this is livestock- or aquaculture-specific in the future, a focussing of the research is required, linked to an objective assessment of available budget, so that each value chain will be supported by an adequate complement of production-related and social scientists (gender, markets/livelihoods, institutions, food systems) to produce a critical mass and to follow the most important aspects for research. Similarly, the program as a whole should maintain a sufficient capacity for synthesis and cross-chain learning. The
evaluation does not make specific recommendations on how streamlining should be exercised and so this should remain a key objective for the CRP(s) in phase II.

The initial value chain research emphasis of the program has been on productivity. However, the evaluation also identifies that the Livestock & Fish CRP can contribute to the IDOs of improved nutrition and the alleviation of poverty. Very little (apart from the work on mola fish, which is a rather specific example; risk in the Vietnam pig value chain) is said in the report on how nutritional improvements will come about and the relationship with A4NH is not elaborated in detail. The Consortium wishes to see how the contribution of animal source foods to targets for improved nutrition will be met in phase II in a concerted fashion across the CGIAR portfolio. This, and the expected goals for poverty alleviation through livestock (writ large) must be part of the new program planning and narrative for phase II proposals.

Recommendation 4: A higher profile for environment and natural resources management (NRM).

Consortium response: Agreed, subject to a better elaboration of the environmental agenda to be undertaken in phase II. The ISPC has urged the formulation of a more comprehensive treatment of livestock and the environmental issues associated with livestock value chains. The evaluation recommends raising the environmental agenda for livestock to the level of a flagship. There could clearly be several entry points to this research, including through the research and management of livestock GHG emissions in key value chains; in relation to the development of feeds and forages; and as part of the resilience agenda in more fragile livestock systems. The phase II programs need to identify the entry points and provide a convincing pathway to the targeted deliverables and beneficiaries to be reached in the next six years of the program(s).

Recommendation 5: Establish a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system based on the (program’s) Theory of Change (TOC)

Consortium response: Agreed as a priority. The evaluation notes that it could not conduct the sort of assessment that it anticipated since the M&E system, the necessary performance figures and, in general terms, the extent of impacts, were not available. The evaluation provides several extenuating circumstances regarding the development of program management tools, IDO targets and changes in the theories of change. However, this remains as a key criticism of CRP management. Donors will not invest in livestock research if the progress and outcomes cannot be measured against a feasible framework. The Livestock program has agreed to the addition of a key M&E position as it develops phase II. This is equally important to the Fish CRP. In the interim, the Consortium will place increased emphasis in annual reporting against the program of work and budget of the L&F CRP.

Recommendation 6: Build private sector partnerships for technology delivery

Consortium response: Agreed. The CO reads this recommendation in conjunction with recommendation 3, to create critical mass around a smaller number of value chain targets, and the evaluation’s urging to create a theory of change for addressing higher CGIAR targets, including the practical means to increase the impact of livestock (L&F) research to date.
**Recommendation 7: Maintain the governance but with some adjustments**

*Consortium response*: Agreed in principle for the remaining year of operation of L&F (however, it will be necessary to reconsider the governance arrangements for Livestock and Fish CRPs separately in phase II). The evaluation’s framing of this issue focusses on the role of the Science Advisory panel, or SPAC, and its relations with the lead Center Director General and Board, but also recommends a much more strategic style of CRP management, rather than simple coordination. As “coordination” tends to lead to the status quo of separate Center contributions, the Consortium expects that new governance arrangements will drive the/each CRP forward in alignment with recommendation 1 and not simply as a collection of Center projects.

This is a matter of importance for follow up by the System Office in the future.

**Recommendation 8: Modernize the financial management system**

*Consortium response*: Agreed. The One Corporate System should be reviewed and its utility assessed against other possible alternatives. Real time program management is required for the Livestock & Fish CRP and its possible derivatives, to be managed adequately against program goals (recommendations 1, 3 and 5).

This recommendation (both on the improvement of the One Corporate System and in moving to improved real time program management and reporting) aligns with the concerns of the Internal Audit Unit for CRPs at large and should be a priority for follow up by the Consortium/System Council.

**Recommendation 9: Maintain the value chain approach but manage it more efficiently**

*Consortium response*: Agreed (in line with comments to recommendation 3). The new CRPs developed for phase II also need to show (both through the ToC and through program design) both how IPGs are created and how smallholder/poor beneficiaries will profit from CRP research. This should be aligned with the evaluation’s discussion of the realism of the program’s slogan that benefits will be realised “by and for the poor”. Maintaining adequate synthetic capacity for program learning and a focus on outcomes and impacts will be required.

**Recommendation 10: Generate more high-quality published outputs**

*Consortium response*: Agreed. This was also the finding of the Elsevier report on CGIAR publications. The L&F CRP did produce some high quality publications in phase I, particularly, for instance, papers relating to livestock and climate and environmental effects of aquaculture. The evaluation believes it could and should produce more, including refereed publications on the specific and synthesised results of value chain research. Publications are one measure of science quality, and the evaluation generally found that the quality of the program’s lead scientists was high. However, the evidence of livestock research impacts beyond papers was low. There was some success in setting up institutional mechanisms for the future. There is still a bridge to cross for both Livestock and Fish CRPs in translating the
program of work not only into IPG outputs but also outcomes which will satisfy the results-based management imperative of the CRPs in phase II.

Consortium’s Overall Response

The evaluation should be considered as the review of a programmatic experiment to more closely integrate the workings of two areas important to the CGIAR portfolio (research on livestock and fish) around value chains for animal source foods. The premise of the program is supported although much of the first three years of the program has been spent in setting up the value chains and partnerships and there are relatively few concrete outcomes. The bulk of published program outputs result from legacy research of the contributing Centers. The recommendations of the evaluation, although provided as brief statements, rest on substantial analysis and synthesis by the panel and are introduced adequately and contextualized in the text of the report. The bulk of the findings of the evaluation are appropriate and each needs to be addressed in the future, notwithstanding the submission of separate Livestock and Fish CRP pre-proposals in August 2015.

The CRP Management response fully accepts all of the Evaluation’s recommendations and provides adequate actions in response. It however notes that, in the expectation that Livestock and Fish will be separate CRPs in phase II, some of the follow up actions will depend upon the new formulation of activities and management in the respective CRPs in 2017. Nevertheless, ILRI as continuing lead Center for the Livestock CRP in phase II undertakes to implement the response to the applicable recommendations in the new Livestock CRP.

The Consortium thanks the evaluation panel Chair and her team for producing a well-argued and readable report of utility to both the L&F CRP and its staff and stakeholders, together with clear guidance for the development of phase II programs.
Executive Summary

Background, context and overview

The CGIAR Research Program (CRP) on Livestock and Fish (L&F) aims to increase the productivity of poor livestock and fish farmers and increase the availability and affordability of meat, milk and fish for poor consumers. Unusually for the CGIAR, it combines livestock and aquaculture research in one program. An important feature of the CRP is a value chain transformation and scaling approach that seeks to make research more relevant to developing countries, and to increase the potential for impact, by implementing applied research in nine target countries.

The CRP was conceived and designed as a ten year program, whose life-span was subsequently reduced to five years. It has been operational since January 2012 and submitted a proposal in November 2014 for an extension to the end of 2016, with some revisions to the program structure. A second phase of CRPs is due to start in 2017 and is likely to involve more substantive changes. Separate pre-proposals for livestock and fish were submitted in August 2015.

The initial three-year budget was USD 99.5 million (including institutional overhead), with a yearly budget of approximately USD 30 million, rising to USD 36 million in the third year of operation. Until the end of 2014 and thus after three years of operations, the total of approved funding was USD 85.1 million and L&F had spent a total of around USD 73 million, of which around half was funded from Window 1 and 2 and half from Window 3 and bilateral projects.

Initially L&F was structured around three different Research Themes with a total of nine components. In 2012, the first year of operation, L&F streamlined its structure, reducing the original three Themes to a new structure of six Themes without components. At the end of 2014 the program was further streamlined, reducing the six Research Themes to five, and renaming the Themes to Flagship Projects (FPs) in accordance with Consortium Office guidelines. The FPs are: Animal Health; Animal Genetics; Feeds & Forages; Systems Analysis for Sustainable Innovation (SASI, which houses social science, environment, systems analysis and nutrition, and the development of the theory of change and monitoring and learning system), and Value Chain Transformation and Scaling (VCTS). VCTS is termed the “delivery” FP while the others are “discovery” FPs. Animal Health has the largest budget, with considerable bilateral funding, followed respectively by Animal Genetics, Feeds & Forages, VCTS and SASI. ILRI, the lead Center, has the largest W1/2 budget and the largest number of bilateral projects, followed by WorldFish, CIAT and ICARDA. The split of W1/W2 funds between Centers was based on the shares of their previous core funding that each Center decided at the outset to allocate to L&F and was maintained throughout.

Evaluation approach and methodology

Approach. The purpose of this evaluation is to inform decision-making and planning by program management, supervisory bodies, CRP donors, partners and other stakeholders with respect to program performance and the potential options for the future. The main stakeholders of the evaluation are the management of L&F, all participating Centers, the ILRI Board, partners associated with the Program, the CGIAR Fund Council, ISPC, the Consortium Office and the Consortium Board.

The remit of the evaluation is to review the existing program, but the findings are relevant to the design of phase 2 programs. The evaluation team has therefore provided feedback on preliminary impressions at each Center and field visit in addition to a more comprehensive feedback session for ILRI and CRP management just prior to the submission of pre-proposals. The evaluation process has been
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participatory and forward looking, with wide consultation among a range of stakeholders in order to capture a representative range of viewpoints.

The evaluation covers all research activities included in L&F, and the processes related to its implementation, and all funding sources. It includes all research lines developed under the present CRP as well as the outputs from relevant “legacy” projects that were initiated in previous CGIAR programs and have carried over into L&F.

**Analytical framework.** The evaluation was based on a dual analytical framework, consisting of thirteen overarching questions addressing major issues, as well as questions related to the evaluation criteria required by the IEA, namely: relevance; quality of science; effectiveness; efficiency; impact, sustainability and cross-cutting issues (partnership, organizational performance, capacity building, gender and environment).

**Methods.** The team drew information from over 370 published document, databases provided by L&F, and the expert knowledge of over 270 stakeholders interviewed in person, by Skype or by phone. In addition, 95 CRP scientists responded to an electronic survey. Those interviewed included Center and CRP management, researchers, partners, representatives of the ILRI Board of Trustees, the Science and Partnership and Advisory Committee (SPAC), the Program Planning and Management Committee, and peer interviewees from intergovernmental organizations, non-government organizations and universities.

Evaluation team members visited three of the four Centers contributing to L&F (ILRI, WorldFish and CIAT). Visits by two team members were made to five of the nine value chain research hubs (Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Tanzania and Viet Nam), while one team member interviewed the value chain coordinator from India in person and a Skype session was held with scientists at the value chain research hub in Egypt. Case studies were developed for the five value chain research hubs visited and for seven research areas within the discovery FPs. Gender mainstreaming and research into environment/natural resource management were separately reviewed as crosscutting areas.

**Main findings and conclusions**

Overall the evaluation concludes that L&F has added value to CGIAR research in livestock and aquaculture and should continue to be funded, either as a joint CRP or as separate Livestock and Aquaculture CRPs. There has been added value in having a multi-Center CRP rather than individual Center programs, in spite of high transactions costs. The value chain approach, although not yet delivering on its promise, is innovative and is generating valuable lessons. Progress in establishing an institutional base and development partnerships in the field has been especially promising. The program is working in several important research areas, has produced a small number of scalable outputs, has made a promising start in mainstreaming gender and is carrying out worthwhile work in environment/natural resource management (NRM). Governance of the program, after some adjustments, is working well.

The main concerns of the evaluation relate to a) lack of focus and coherence within the program portfolio as a whole and in the way the value chain approach is managed and b) inadequacy of the management system to cope with a complex, multi-site program. Both of these factors are impeding delivery of outputs and outcomes and must be addressed.

Beyond the control of L&F, the evaluation is also concerned about the potential impact on delivery of inconsistencies at Fund Council and Consortium level, namely the instability of core funding, frequent changes in reporting requirements and uncertainty about future directions of all CRPs.
Organizational performance

The governance arrangements of L&F are clearly structured, well-functioning and up to requirements in terms of legitimacy, accountability, transparency, equity, effectiveness, efficiency and independence, particularly after the recent adjustments made in the roles of and relationship between the Science and Partnership Advisory Committee, the Program Planning and Management Committee and the ILRI Board of Trustees. The evaluators advise against changing this well-functioning governance system in the second phase of the CRPs.

The evaluation has identified a number of problems with systems for managing research, reporting, staff and finance. The size and complexity of the CRP require management systems beyond those of an individual Center. The CGIAR One Corporate System should have met the requirements for CRP management but it has not been installed in all CGIAR Centers and is only in 2015 being introduced in ILRI, the lead Center for L&F, in accordance with the agreed sequence of adoption by Centers. L&F has installed a stop-gap system based on manual entry and spreadsheets for research reporting and financial management. This, with considerable work from CRP management, has enabled L&F to satisfy main reporting requirements but needs considerable work to update; there is a high and risky dependency on one person.

There is a need to make the entire reporting system more joined-up and efficient and to complete the recently initiated process of aligning research reporting with the CRP’s Theory of change. It is also essential to transition the financial reporting system from one that is spreadsheet-based to a centralized and modern database. L&F will naturally continue to depend on the financial systems of participating Centers, but should build on systems already developed by other CRPs to more effectively and efficiently collect and collate CRP-related information. The evaluation team recognizes that the transition process is likely to be painful but it is necessary to create long-term transparency and efficiency.

L&F management has been inclusive, transparent and serviceable; program staff in particular appreciate the management style. The system of internal and external communication of L&F is timely, comprehensive and open-access; it builds on the effective communication system of ILRI. The evaluation commends the transparency and inclusiveness of L&F’s management but considers that the complexity of the CRP and the need to focus and make choices at times require a management style that is strategic rather than coordinative.

CRP management has benefited from a high degree of continuity from 2013 until early 2015. However four out of the seven persons in the management team left by the end of September 2015 as a result of the 19 percent cut in W1/W2 funds communicated in March 2015. The evaluation team is concerned that this may, in the future, reduce management effectiveness and efficiency.

Approximately 50 percent of the funding came from central W1/W2 sources; for the other 50 percent bilateral projects are mapped against the CRP. Overheads generated by bilateral projects are insufficient to cover all the maintenance and capital costs of a large Center rich in laboratories like ILRI, whose long-term sustainability will be threatened without a sustainable source of such funding.

Outwith the responsibility of L&F but within the remit of the Consortium Office is the need to stabilize core funding. Allowing Centers to carry-over funding within the life of a CRP, and thus create strategic funds, is an important tool for stabilization. So is improved long-term forecasting in order to prevent sudden downward changes in fund allocations compared to budget forecasts.
The CRP portfolio

The evaluation addressed two aspects of L&F’s research portfolio, namely relevance and design coherence. L&F works towards the program maxim of “more meat milk and fish, by and for the poor”, and six key Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs) that between them encompass international public goods and every major global development need to which research in livestock and aquaculture might be expected to contribute. The targets set for the IDOs have taken time to develop for a variety of reasons, some relating to system-wide changes in the way that IDOs were defined, and these targets are still vague. All of this gives the CRP scope to work on more topics than it could possibly manage, even with the capacity of four contributing Centers.

The evaluation concluded that all of the discovery FP research activities currently conducted are broadly relevant, in that they fall within the scope of the IDOs and the remit of the CRP. Some are more obviously relevant than others but none are irrelevant. Likewise, all of the value chains under the VCTS FP are relevant to the needs of the countries in which they are located and the L&F IDOs.

However there is a great need to focus and streamline the portfolios. Delivery of international public goods will require scalable, game-changing outputs. L&F has delivered few outputs so far that fit this description or could be considered substantial progress towards game-changing outputs. The program will be better able to deliver international public goods (IPGs) if it is more clearly focused around a limited number of key research areas. Rather than provide prescriptive recommendations about the content of the portfolio – since it was not realistic to attempt a comprehensive prioritization process within the time frame of the evaluation - the evaluators have made broad suggestions about streamlining and the delivery of IPGs in a phased process that continues during the formulation of phase 2 proposals.

Two areas would merit a higher profile in the future. One is environment and NRM research, given the global importance of this topic, which could merit an FP on the subject to make it more visible. The other is aquaculture genetics, which has already generated a scalable output. In a combined L&F CRP this would justify a higher profile and in a fish CRP it would merit a FP.

Environment and gender

Environment was specifically assessed because it is a topic of global importance to the livestock sector that is addressed as a cross-cutting issue within L&F. The environmental and NRM activities of L&F have included some very high-quality science. The global-level environmental impacts of livestock and fish value chains have been the subjects of significant research within L&F, the country- or region-specific issues much less so. For vulnerabilities of livestock and fish value chains to environmental shocks and trends the situation is somewhat reversed, as these have been addressed in local forms heightened by the value chain research, rather than at the global level.

Work has been of particularly high quality around global-level modelling, collating evidence on the environmental impacts of aquaculture, and breeding of Brachiaria for biological nitrification inhibition. There is a clear possibility that the first two could have impacts on policy, though extra steps of policy engagement by the program will be needed. The Brachiaria work also will require several further well-planned steps before it can contribute to greenhouse gas emission reductions at scale. At the level of local landscapes or farms the work in Nicaragua show the greatest indications of future impact – it is working on a problem identified with local partners, towards locally-established partners, in close cooperation with farmers, and has produced promising early results.

The research that has been done is very important for the essential tasks of managing livestock-related environmental (including climate impacts) and impacts of environmental (including climate) trends on
livestock value chains. It has been even more important as work on these themes, and especially on climate adaptation for livestock systems under the CRP on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security has apparently been very limited. However, under L&F, the position of environment/NRM research as a sub-cluster under SASI, in other words two organizational levels below a FP, has limited its effectiveness and ability to respond to environmental priorities identified within the country hubs. A higher profile would be beneficial.

Gender was specifically assessed because it is important within the CGIAR as a whole. The positioning of gender within the L&F structure was reviewed, because gender has been moved each time the program has been restructured. The evaluation concluded that re-positioning of gender within the CRP structure has not so far affected its ability to deliver. A strong strategy and team have been more important than the precise position of gender within the program.

The evaluation also assessed the extent to which gender has been operationally mainstreamed within L&F, and the delivery of the research program. There has been good progress in mainstreaming within the VCTS FP. Progress has been slower in the other FPs and mostly limited to scientists with strong field interests and experience. The gender team needs to build momentum in working with the technology FPs and would see the greatest impact from working with selected research groups that have already shown interest, to build positive examples of good practice.

Delivery of outputs has been slow but has speeded up after engaging a strong partner, the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT). The evaluation considers that the engagement of KIT has been positive. Progress towards outcomes will require the gender team to expand the scope of its work and is hard to assess at present.

The capacity of the gender team, together with the key partner KIT, has been sufficient for the work it has needed to until now, but it will have to be expanded in number and skills to deal with future needs. This could be done through core staff recruitment or international research partners. Lack of a senior gender scientist to lead the team is a concern and likely to be a constraint to future development.

Science quality

The evaluators have no serious concerns about the quality of scientific output. It is clear that L&F has the ability to produce outputs of high quality and indeed is doing so. There have been some excellent reports and peer-reviewed publications, mostly from legacy work. Every flagship has produced useful published material as have most value chain research hubs.

However the evaluation is concerned about the generally low level of publications in internationally recognised journals, and also considers that L&F should be producing more excellent rather than good or acceptable grey literature. A backlog of data awaiting analysis was reported from every FP and value chain research hub. There is also a greater need for consistency of attention in planning and design of field projects.

There have been some missed opportunities for cross discipline projects and greater use of cutting-edge technology and techniques. The program could also benefit from a more strategic exploitation of international collaboration with the intention of filling skill gaps and increasing the critical mass of researchers and resources in areas where they are lacking. The evaluation recognizes that this may take time as bilateral funding may need to be raised to enable new partners to collaborate.

Incentives for producing outputs were apparent at the Centers but not at L&F program level. There may be value in introducing CRP-specific incentives, provided they do not duplicate existing Center mechanisms. Several suggestions were made by L&F scientists for linking modest increments in funding, or other incentives, to research performance within the CRP.
The experienced scientists who lead teams throughout the program, and the highly committed researchers, are L&F’s greatest asset but they are spread thinly across a wide range of projects and many of them are over-stretched. In most FPs and particularly VCTS there is a need for more human capacity in the form of postgraduate scientists, to provide a critical mass and/or fill gaps in specific expertise. There is a need to improve and perhaps formalize certain processes within the CRP in order to make best use of scientific capacity.

Mentoring of younger scientists is uneven across the program and highly Center-based. L&F would benefit from an expanded mentoring system across the CRP, developed in a way that is consistent with existing Center research management, to ensure that good practices are used more uniformly – this might involve more formalized mentoring processes within CRP research groups, or dissemination through a community of practice.

The value chain approach

The value chain transformation and scaling approach has been a keystone of L&F and one of its most appreciated features. It was initiated with the aim of making L&F’s work more relevant to field problems and to help it deliver research outputs more directly and rapidly to potential end users. By working through nine country-based value chain research hubs, each focusing on a single species or commodity, it has achieved sufficient diversity to provide a broad spectrum of experiences from which to draw lessons.

The evaluation was impressed by the investment in institutional relationships and development partnerships, providing a solid foundation for applied research. The CGIAR Centers have reached far beyond their traditional national agricultural research system partners to work with government extension agencies, producer co-operatives and NGOs. Several of the development partners interviewed were clear that they see the relationship with the CGIAR as a strategic one with long term potential. They also talked of the value of having a closer relationship with the CGIAR and the mutual learning that has taken place. Donors who have provided bilateral funding to value chain research hubs were broadly positive about their experience of working with L&F and some have funded more than one project.

There are already visible outputs in some countries. Applied research involving national partners is taking place in seven value chains and planning and assessments have been conducted in the remaining two. Research is still concentrated at the producer end of the value chains, the “comfort zone” for the CGIAR, but has been spreading along the chains, with some work on inputs and recent collaborations with the CRP on Agriculture for Nutrition and Health. There has been strong collaboration between social and biological scientists.

However, L&F has only very partially delivered on the potential of the value chain approach, for a number of reasons. The resourcing of research hubs has been sub-optimal and this is a critical issue. The core teams are too small to carry out all of their necessary work in managing/conducting research, publishing, fund-raising and reporting to multiple stakeholders. While it is inevitable that they should need to prioritize what they work on, the funding deficit has resulted in a generally low level of published outputs as well as incomplete research portfolios where questions of potential importance to local stakeholders are not considered because the team does not include the skill-set to address them. Given inherent tension between funding limitations and the evolving research needs within livestock value chains, it may in hindsight have been preferable to find different ways to spread resources across research hubs, and this is a lesson to consider for the future. The abrupt funding cut in 2015 has seriously hampered research in some value chains and has created uncertainty about the
continuity of L&F into the second phase and future CGIAR commitment to the value chain research hubs.

Field testing and delivery has mostly been on a very small scale although there are indications it could expand nationally or internationally through development partnerships and local institutions. Substantive published outputs from individual research hubs, or a synthesis of work across several hubs, would be excellent vehicles for wider delivery of research outputs. However very few such outputs have yet emerged or appear to be in the pipeline. In addition, L&F has not capitalized on the opportunity offered by the CRP’s field presence in nine countries to pursue research into action research processes, or the best strategies for scaling, both of which would be noteworthy IPGs. The evaluation recognizes that there may be challenges in obtaining funding for this type of research. However the results would be of great value to the donor as well as the research community and, if appropriately packaged, this type of research could be included within programs funded by development donors. Apart from the introduction of a few useful tools and techniques, the VCTS FP is not being managed in a coherent fashion to create economies of scope and scale. The research hubs largely operate as separate entities, with no systematic approach to seeking assistance from discovery FPs, developing a community of practice, sharing scientific findings, or collective reflection and learning.

In spite of shortcomings in the present management and delivery of the value chain approach the evaluation believes that it should not be abandoned but rather managed more effectively. It is taking L&F out of a CGIAR “comfort zone” and providing valuable lessons. L&F can function effectively in a field setting and with a more development-oriented approach than would have been possible in earlier CGIAR programs.

Effectiveness and impact

The evaluation reviewed delivery of activities and outputs and progress towards outcomes. The insufficiency of the reporting system made it challenging to assess progress on any level. It was particularly difficult to assess progress towards outcomes, because of the complex theory of change involving local research on interventions followed by upscaling largely through development partners, but also because indicators for IDOs are incomplete. In addition, notwithstanding the extensive information contained in local and national-level situation analyses and value chain assessments, there were no systematic early baseline surveys against which to make an assessment. The Theory of Change (including the impact pathways) has been redefined several times and has never been available in a complete form. Very recently a pilot project was initiated to report progress against impact pathways, and to include reporting on the change process. Early results look promising, and if extended across the program this initiative offers the possibility of more clearly aligning research progress to development impact.

The evaluation considers L&F’s lack of a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system to be a serious problem. CRP Management is aware of the problem, SPAC considers it to be a weakness and it has forced this evaluation to rely less than had been anticipated on facts and figures and more on expert opinion and qualitative assessments. There are several reasons why a M&E system has not been established. These include: the absence of a system-wide model or best-practice recommendations within the CGIAR on which to base the L&F model; the complex structure and geography of the CRP; the inconsistency between reporting requirements of L&F management, the Consortium Office and bilateral donors; multiple changes to the Theory of Change (TOC), which could otherwise have been an important monitoring reference; and a changing CRP structure with unclear reporting responsibilities. The evaluation is concerned that the CRP will not be able to develop a M&E system
until the end of the current program, particularly because one person dealing with M&E in the CRP management had to leave in the first half of 2015 due to the announced severe budget cuts.

L&F is making reasonable progress in delivering outputs and some progress towards outcomes, although it is hard to predict a delivery date for much of what it is working on. The evaluation found areas of good progress and others where progress has been slow, in every FP and Center. The more traditional discovery FPs (Animal Health, Animal Genetics and Feeds & Forages) have been more successful in completing planned activities and delivering outputs than the novel VCTS and SASI FPs. The VCTS FP has been slow in developing research activities because of the time needed to make investments in institutional relationships and seek operational funding, the small size of core teams, and changes in the countries chosen. The SASI FP is a recent entity, assembled in 2014 from parts of previous Themes. It has an incoherent structure and delivery is hard to assess. However, both of the novel FPs have the potential to deliver well if their structural incoherence can be overcome and each is doing innovative work. It is also important to remember that every FP has a role to play in overall coherence of the CRP beyond the delivery of specific research outputs.

Center-based research includes outputs that have potentially high impact but very uncertain and potentially distant delivery dates – these include livestock vaccines and diagnostics and livestock and forage germplasm. L&F could be more explicit in about reviewing their progress in annual meetings and Annual Reports. It could also do more to explore the delivery pathways that will eventually be needed for these outputs – which might include connections with delivery partners, including those in the private sector. There is also need for explicit consideration of the route by which these technologies will reach small-scale farmers. A good start has been made by WorldFish, which has developed policy papers on technology transfer. Country-based research has the potential to deliver more quickly. However there is a need for L&F to be clearer in conceiving and communicating to donors the path it is following towards development outcomes and for donors to be realistic about the time needed for meticulous research.

There is a good chance that L&F will create local impact within the countries where it works and in most countries it is beginning to do this. However at the current stage in L&F’s life-cycle there are only very few examples where a broader national impact has been created, and even fewer where impact has been seen in more than one country. L&F will need to pay attention to synthesis and coherence across the VCTS FP, and indeed across the whole CRP, if it is to deliver IPGs. For example, there has been interesting work in environmental analysis that has potential to contribute to IPGs. Some of this is reported within SASI and some from value chain hubs and only by reviewing the entire program is it possible to see the full value of the research. CRP management’s proposals to convert the VCTS Flagship Leader from a part-time to a full-time assignment and establish a Research Methods specialist position within VCTS, responses to recommendations of the CRP-commissioned evaluation of the value chain approach, would be positive steps towards improved synthesis and coherence.

The evaluation has made the following ten recommendations.

**Recommendation 1: Capitalize on the benefits of being a CRP**

It has been valuable to have a CRP that brings Centers together within one program and this should continue. However, L&F has failed to fully capitalize on the benefits of being a CRP. The following are recommended to CRP management. The strategic leadership of the CRP Director will be important in accomplishing these goals:

- a stronger emphasis on CRP-wide research initiatives that will produce game-changing outputs;
Evaluation of the CRP on Livestock and Fish

- stronger engagement as a CRP in global public debates on livestock, poverty and development;
- whole-CRP approaches to major donors.

L&F has also not fully succeeded in managing the complexities of the CRP. Recommendations 4, 7 and 9 all deal with this issue.

**Recommendation 2: Increase synergies between livestock and aquaculture**

Regardless of whether livestock and aquaculture remain together in one program, stronger attempts should be made to capitalize on potential synergies between them, including the development of a larger portfolio of substantial projects that brings them together.

**Recommendation 3. Streamline the portfolio**

In order to deliver game-changing outputs in the future, and considering the resources that are available and the system complexity, the portfolio will need to be streamlined into areas of greatest potential impact on IDOs taking into account scientific capacity. The streamlining should take place in the context of the TOC and should ensure a balance between short, medium and long term outputs, based on very clear decision criteria. A discussion on streamlining/prioritisation should be started immediately, with changes implemented gradually and realized fully under phase 2. The evaluation acknowledges that this is a substantial task that is likely to need outside assistance, since it has not been possible within the scope of the present detailed examination of the CRP to make specific recommendations on streamlining. It is likely that L&F can achieve part of the desired result by implementing changes suggested under other recommendations. In future proposals the evaluation would strongly recommend not increasing the number of FPs or value chain sites. CRP management will also need to at times to use a more strategic leadership to guide the development and delivery of a more streamlined portfolio.

**Recommendation 4: A higher profile for environment/NRM**

A higher profile for work on environment and natural resource management is recommended. In Phase 2 this could take the form of a flagship program on the topic, which would allow a) more space to develop objectives and workplans that covered a range of livestock-environment interactions, b) more visibility for environment in reporting and M&E and c) clearer lines of accountability through a flagship leader compared to the current complex leadership arrangements.

**Recommendation 5: Establish a M&E system based on the TOC**

L&F should complete the development of the TOC (including impact pathways) and ensure that a M&E system is established in line with the TOC, building on the pilot initiatives carried out during 2015. It should also ensure that baseline studies are carried out that will facilitate impact assessment of key research areas.

**Recommendation 6: Build private sector partnerships for technology delivery**

Build carefully-chosen partnerships with commercial companies, including partners in developing countries and multinationals with expertise in developing country markets, in order to deliver the pipeline from technology research to application. Potential commercial links/partnerships could be established to allow research to follow commercial requirements for registration/target product profiles. These should be seen as strategic public-private partnerships linking the national governments, the CGIAR and private companies. At the same time it is important to continue building
and strengthening strategic relationships with development partners to ensure that delivery channels for technology take account of the needs of poor farmers.

**Recommendation 7: Maintain the governance arrangements but with some adjustments**

a) associate the Director General of ILRI more with SPAC deliberations in order to align ILRI and CRP programs (by more extended participation in SPAC meetings);

b) establish a periodic interaction between the SPAC chair and ILRI Board program committee chair (an annual physical meeting is suggested);

c) provide the SPAC regularly with summarized (gross) financial and administrative information so that it is aware of the financial constraints of the CRP.

**Recommendation 8: Modernize the financial management system**

It is recommended that, as a matter of urgency, the systems of financial management are modernized to fit the requirements of a complex, multi-site program. In particular reporting relationships and products need to be simplified in order to reduce the administrative burden particularly on middle level managers. A move should also be made from present reliance on spreadsheets to adoption of a joined-up financial database. As One Corporate System is just being introduced in two of the Centers it will not bring the expected efficiency gains for some time to come. Instead L&F should urgently explore the possibility to introduce its own project management system, drawing from the experience of other CRPs, such as Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security and Water, Land and Ecosystems to more effectively and efficiently collect information from participating Centers. Ideally, structures of the participating Centers and L&F should be harmonized.

**Recommendation 9. Maintain the value chain approach but manage it much more effectively**

The evaluation recommends that the value chain approach or its functional equivalent is continued but that considerable changes are made to increase the value added by the approach: a) every value chain hub should be properly resourced, at a higher level than is currently the case – even if this means working in a smaller number of countries or establishing a 2-tier system of value chains; b) the roles of the VCTS flagship, the country research hubs and SASI should be clarified with respect to producing knowledge to transform and scale up value chains; c) the role of the leader of the VCTS should be reformulated with a strong emphasis on communication and learning across value chains and a mandate to interact with every value chain; d) there should be a much stronger emphasis on synthesis of results in published papers.

**Recommendation 10: Generate more high-quality published outputs**

While the evaluation has no serious concerns about quality of science, the following recommendations are made. L&F should:

a) clear the backlog and increase effort on producing high-quality peer-reviewed publications aiming for internationally recognized journals (where appropriate in collaboration with outside scientists);

b) continue to produce non externally peer reviewed high-quality outputs but thoroughly and systematically peer reviewed internally that can be disseminated broadly and quickly— but with more focus on syntheses and big-picture analyses;

c) increase the number of publications that are interdisciplinary (e.g. genetics and feeds; animal health and social science; animal genetics and animal health);

d) increase and systematize mentoring for young scientists.
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Management Response and Action Plan

The management of the Livestock & Fish (L&F) CRP appreciates the opportunity to respond to the IEE report. L&F CRP management would like to congratulate the IEE panel on its full engagement in conducting the evaluation and its constructive, insightful and forward-looking analysis. We also want to thank the IEA office for its careful planning and facilitation of the evaluation process. The resulting process has been open and inclusive with the engagement of the lead and partner centre staff and management, the L&F Science & Partnership Advisory Committee and the ILRI Board. This response reflects their collective input.

A. Overall Response to the Evaluation Report

CRP management fully agrees with the main findings and recommendations presented in the evaluation report. We are pleased to note that the panel concluded that:

- The L&F CRP has added value to CGIAR research in livestock and aquaculture and should continue to be funded
- Its value chain approach is innovative, is generating valuable lessons and is one of the CRP’s most appreciated features
- Especially promising progress has been made in establishing an institutional base and development partnerships in the field to provide a solid foundation for applied research
- The governance of the program is working well, and L&F CRP management has been inclusive, transparent and serviceable
- It is clear that L&F has the ability to produce outputs of high quality and indeed is doing so.

The report identifies a number of concerns and in light of these, offers ten recommendations. In most cases, the CRP management has shared these concerns but was not making sufficient progress in addressing them. We appreciate the multiple references made by the IEE panel to acknowledge the challenges and the context faced by the CRP management and program partners, especially with respect to the start-up nature of this first CRP phase and the substantial institutional and financial uncertainty, constraints and transactions costs experienced. With these caveats, the IEE findings and recommendations help to sharpen the focus and prioritize certain efforts.

In framing the Action Plan, CRP management recognizes the complexity of the institutional context and timing. The L&F CRP will end operations at the end of 2016, so the timing together with overall CRP budget constraints limit the opportunity and rationale for implementing major actions within the short time remaining. The L&F CRP also has limited scope to make commitments on behalf of the successor CRPs on Fish and Livestock that will continue much of the CRP research agenda from 2017. ILRI will continue as the lead centre for the Livestock CRP, but commitments proposed for the Fish and Livestock CRPs will need to be adopted by the yet-to-be-constituted Independent Steering Committees for those CRPs and by WorldFish management as the lead centre for the Fish CRP.
However the CRP will ensure that the recommendations are made widely available to those responsible for the two future CRPs, including the new Independent Steering Committees. The proposed actions are therefore framed much in the forward-looking spirit of the IEE itself and are designed to facilitate the transition to and strengthen the foundation of the new CRPs. ILRI as lead centre of the L&F CRP and of its successor Livestock CRP is able to commit to ensuring the Action Plan is taken forward into the Livestock CRP to the extent possible.

B. Response to Recommendations

As advised by the IEA guidance, the responses to individual recommendations presented in the IEE report are provided in the following Response Matrix/Action Table.

Lindsay Falvey  
Board Chair  
International Livestock Research Institute, ILRI, lead centre for the Livestock and Fish CRP

Jimmy Smith  
Director General
## Response Matrix / Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Recommendation (numbered)</th>
<th>Management Response to the Recommendation</th>
<th>Action to be taken (each action should have a reference number)</th>
<th>Management Follow up</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Is additional funding required to implement recommendation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1: Capitalize on the benefits of being a CRP</strong>&lt;br&gt;The strategic leadership of the CRP director will be important in accomplishing these goals:&lt;br&gt;a) a stronger emphasis on CRP-wide research initiatives that will produce game-changing outputs;&lt;br&gt;b) stronger engagement as a CRP in global public debates on livestock, poverty and development;&lt;br&gt;c) whole-CRP approaches to major donors.</td>
<td><strong>Fully accept.</strong> The primary focus of the L&amp;F CRP was to establish a more impact-oriented model for animal R4D based on the value chain approach, which the panel recognized as showing promise as a CRP-wide research initiative. Over the past year, the CRP has also been exploring how it could develop a major initiative on animal-source food that would engage research across the CRP and position the CRP to engage in global debates on sustainable diets. We agree that initiatives of this type regarding sustainable intensification and diets are an important role of the CRP and could be attractive to donors.</td>
<td>To address all three goals, effort will be dedicated during this final year to the program to develop two major initiatives to be taken forward under the successor 2nd phase Fish and Livestock CRPs:&lt;br&gt;1. Prepare a proposal for a major program to more directly address the issue of the role of animal-source foods in sustainable diets, including components of foresight and trade-off analysis for policy engagement, as well as technological and institutional innovation to support more effective use of animal-source foods;&lt;br&gt;1.2 Prepare a proposal for a major research program to support sustainable intensification of animal agriculture based on the value chain approach, building on the lessons learned under the L&amp;F CRP and ILRI’s engagement in various global initiatives on this theme.</td>
<td>Who Responsible for Action&lt;br&gt;1.1 CRP MU, ILRI DDG&lt;br&gt;1.2 CRP MU, ILRI DDG</td>
<td>2016 Q2-Q4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2: Increase synergies between livestock and aquaculture</strong>&lt;br&gt;The major opportunities for synergies pursued under L&amp;F were considered to be in the areas of genetic</td>
<td><strong>Fully accept.</strong> The major opportunities for synergies pursued under L&amp;F were considered to be in the areas of genetic</td>
<td>During the remainder of the L&amp;F CRP in 2016:&lt;br&gt;2.1 Continue to implement</td>
<td>2.1 CRP MU; Animal Health</td>
<td>2016 Q1-Q4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
improvement and animal-source food value chain development. The different nature of fish versus livestock breeding strategies however was found to limit sharing of capacity and methods. Integrating fish and livestock value chain development and gender was more effective. More recently, WorldFish has created capacity for research on health and feeds. We will therefore continue to support collaborative activities in the areas to be taken forward under the next phase Fish and Livestock CRPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Streamline the portfolio</th>
<th><strong>Fully accept.</strong> Prioritization of research activities advised by the IEE panel is consistent with ongoing processes and CO/FO guidance to adapt to declining W1/2 budgets during the final year of the L&amp;F CRP. This is also stressed by the guidance for phase 2 CRP proposals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Scarce W1/2 funding will be prioritized towards fewer value chains in the final year of the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. The 2nd phase Livestock CRP proposal to identify a core agenda for priority outputs at the Flagship/Cluster level to be funded by W1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. Conduct a rapid ex-ante impact assessment of the main research lines proposed for the phase 2 Livestock CRP to support prioritization in phase 2. The exercise is in progress. The methodology will be made IRLMC; Livestock CRP Planning Task Force; (WorldFish MC) 2016 Q1 No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: A higher profile for environment/NRM</td>
<td>Fully accept. The development of livestock-related environment and NRM research under the current L&amp;F CRP has been focused on methods for assessing potential impacts of livestock and aquaculture value chain development; aspects related to climate change were to be addressed under CCAFS, but declining funding has limited implementation of that agenda. We agree that this agenda merits expansion and a higher profile, which is especially appropriate given the broader mandate of the 2nd phase Fish and Livestock CRPs. Both successor CRPs intend to propose flagships which have a clear environmental focus. In addition, priority areas for strong collaboration have been agreed between the Livestock CRP and the WLE and CCAFS CRPs for phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Establish an M&amp;E system based on the TOC</td>
<td>Fully accept. In the absence of guidance on M&amp;E best practice appropriate for the CGIAR context and as noted in the panel’s analysis, the L&amp;F CRP has been engaging with evaluation experts to develop a ToC-based M&amp;E framework and pilot an M&amp;E system that includes Change Pathways established for target value chains and flagship projects. The objective is to have a comprehensive M&amp;E system that effectively links research prioritization, planning and monitoring of progress, and research evaluation to monitoring implementation performance of the program and its constituent parts, and to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
have this system in place or well advanced for the 2nd phase. This comprehensive system, fit for purpose for AR4D, will be supported by an online database and reporting system.

system to serve both performance monitoring and outcome evaluation on the basis of ToC, impact pathways and outcome targets.

| 6: Build private sector partnerships for technology delivery | Fully accept. Developing partnership with the private sector, both in stimulating inclusive small- and medium-scale business development services at local level and in establishing strategic collaboration with the larger-scale commercial sector with respect both to contributing to research and to delivery of research outputs at scale, has certainly been a constant objective of all of the research teams. Identifying potential partners with appropriately aligned objectives and formulating partnership arrangements that meet the public mission of the CRP and the commercial objectives of the private sector remains a constant challenge. While the CRP has a number of ongoing, successful partnerships at international and local level, we agree that there is certainly scope for more. |
| 6.1. As noted in the response to Recommendation 9 below, a central component of the management response to the CCEE on value chain development is to strengthen the leadership of the overall value chain work with a dedicated position having an agri-business orientation to improve the relevance and pragmatism of the research solutions under development. A CIM position has been established for this purpose and an expert is to take up the post on 1 Feb 2016. The expert will be made responsible explicitly for identifying strategies and opportunities and providing practical implementation guidance for private sector partnerships at national and local level to enhance scaling up and out of CRP outputs. |
| 6.2. Schedule a session with the L&F CRP management committee (PPMC) and advisory committee (SPAC), facilitated by the agri-business expert, to review the L&F experience in developing partnership with the private sector and make recommendations for the next phase CRPs on how to build on the lessons learned. | CRP MU, PPCMC | 2016 Q3-Q4 | No |
| 7: Maintain the governance arrangements but with some adjustments | Fully accept. We agree with the Panel’s analysis and appreciate the recognition of the appropriateness of the governance arrangements established by the CRP. During 2015 we had already begun implementing the Panel’s sub-recommendations:  
- The ILRI DG has been more directly involved in SPAC deliberations and in regular communication with the SPAC chair  
- At the request of the ILRI Board, the SPAC chair initiated an annual report to the ILRI Board Program Committee (which is a Committee of the Whole) presented during a session dedicated to the CRP, which allows for direct interaction between the SPAC chair and Board committee members; this will be continued in 2016  
- CRP financial information provided to the PPMC and ILRI Board will also be shared with SPAC, and the SPAC reviews the POWB.  
The Panel’s recommendation to maintain key features of the existing governance arrangements is not aligned with the current Consortium Board recommendations; the Fish and Livestock CRPs’ governance arrangements will adopt the Consortium Board guidance. | 7.1 The ILRI DG to continue being directly involved in SPAC deliberations and in regular communication with the SPAC chair  
7.2 The SPAC chair to make annual report to the ILRI Board Program Committee  
7.3 CRP financial information provided to SPAC. | CRP MU, SPAC Chair | 2016 Q2-Q4 | No |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8: Modernize the financial management system</td>
<td>Fully accept. This has been a recognized challenge across the participating centers and each is in the process of implementing OCS. The lead centre, ILRI, is also currently engaged in a year-long effort with Accenture to establish a project management</td>
<td>8.1. Complete implementation of OCS with the roll-out of the remaining modules and explore mechanisms to facilitate transfer and aggregation of financial and other project information between</td>
<td>ILRI MC</td>
<td>2016 Q1-Q4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Maintain the value chain approach but manage it much more effectively

a) every value chain hub should be properly resourced, at a higher level than is currently the case – even if this means working in a smaller number of countries or establishing a 2-tier system of value chains

b) the roles of the VCTS flagship, the country research hubs and SASI should be clarified with respect to producing knowledge to transform and scale up value chains

c) the role of the leader of the VCTS should be reformulated with a strong emphasis on communication and

Fully accept. We have very much appreciated the endorsement of both the CCEE and the IEE for the value chain approach adopted by the L&F CRP. The insightful and constructive critique of the challenges we have faced has been extremely useful. The IEE comments reinforce those made by the CCEE. The management response to the CCEE—which has been delayed in implementation due to the funding cuts and uncertainty about the next phase CRPs—would appear to address as well the IEE comments:

- Resourcing of value chain work: Financing the value chain research has been a challenge. A balance was sought between having too few sites to permit comparative research designs versus having too many sites with inadequate critical mass. Available Window 1/2 funding could support only a bare minimum which needed to be supplemented by bilateral funding. This strategy was working in several countries, but in some countries, the supplemental bilateral funding could not be mobilized. The response has been to consider a two-tier level of investment to focus the limited Window 1/2 funding more strategically on ensuring a more complete effort in the countries demonstrating

| 9.1 Propose more focused investment in fewer livestock value chain teams under the phase 2 Livestock CRP | 9.1 ILRI MC, Livestock CRP Planning Task Force |
| 9.2 As the Livestock CRP proposal is finalized, recruit the research methods support specialist aligned with the needs of the next phase CRP. | 9.2 CRP MU, PPCMC |
| 9.1 2016 Q1 | 9.2 2016 Q2-Q4 | No |
learning across value chains and a mandate to interact with every value chain
d) there should be a much stronger emphasis on synthesis of results in published papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning across value chains and a mandate to interact with every value chain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>momentum. Declining W1/2 funding has made this response more urgent, and it is reflected in the 2016 POWB with reduced funding to the less active value chains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Getting to scale: A central component of the management response to the CCEE is to strengthen the leadership of the overall value chain work with a dedicated position having an agri-business orientation to improve the relevance and pragmatism of the research solutions under development. This position would be responsible explicitly for identifying strategies and opportunities and providing practical implementation guidance and support in developing partnerships with business actors for the value chain teams to link their research outputs into larger scale development actions, and to create a more effective community of practice across the teams. Establishing the position was delayed pending finalization of the phase 2 proposal to ensure it is appropriately defined to fit the needs of the next phase; since the Transformation &amp; Scaling Flagship will not be continued, the position has been revised to serve as an agri-business expert without leadership responsibility and the position is being filled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase scientific learning and output: Another key component of the management response to the CCEE is to strengthen the research design and learning with a dedicated position on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
research methods to support and coordinate research design and outputs of the value chain teams by ensuring cross-site design and rigor. This position would also address the issue of ensuring rigor in action research methods and analysis of scaling experiences. Success of this support will be measured in terms of increased publication.

It is clearly the intention of both the next phase Fish and Livestock CRPs to continue a value chain approach, and as we get more clarity of the proposals being taken forward for the two CRPs, the proposed actions under the management response to the CCEE will be adjusted appropriately and implemented as a transition to the Livestock CRP, and will inform the relevant features of the Fish CRP.

### 10: Generate more high-quality published outputs

**L&F should:**

- a) clear the backlog and increase effort on producing high-quality peer-reviewed publications aiming for internationally recognized journals (where appropriate in collaboration with outside scientists);
- b) continue to produce non externally peer-reviewed publications

| Fully accept. Ensuring a pipeline of high-quality scientific outputs in terms of both internally and externally peer-reviewed publications, and especially those in high-impact ISI journals, is the perennial challenge for CGIAR research management. As the L&F CRP is now in its final year and some research activities are winding down (but many will also continue into the next phase CRPs), we are stressing the need to devote significant effort to finalizing publications and undertaking synthesis. It will also be an appropriate time for the L&F CRP management committee to review the publication success and make recommendations for the next phase CRPs. | 10.1. Give priority to W1/2 allocation (and bilateral funding, where possible) to preparation of publications and synthesis activities in the 2016 Plan of Work and Budget for each flagship
  10.2 Schedule a session with the L&F CRP management committee (PPMC) and advisory committee (SPAC) to review publication performance and scientist mentoring, and make recommendations for the next phase CRPs on how to improve that performance | 10.1 Flagship leaders, PPCMC
  10.2 CRP MU, PPCMC, SPAC Chair | 10.1 2016 Q1
  10.2 2016 Q3-Q4 | No |
reviewed high-quality outputs but thoroughly and systematically peer reviewed internally that can be disseminated broadly and quickly—but with more focus on syntheses and big-picture analyses;

c) increase the number of publications that are interdisciplinary (e.g. genetics and feeds; animal health and social science; animal genetics and animal health);

d) increase and systematize mentoring for young scientists.

| research management to ensure high quality research and targeting high-impact outlets. ILRI is currently introducing target numbers of publications for its scientists, along with other indicator of performance. Based on the IEE recommendation, it will be important to review the performance to date and identify CRP-level strategies that could provide incentives for improving that performance to inform phase 2 CRP management
| b) Again, the CRP has relied on each centre’s own quality control processes; this merits review for improving phase 2 CRP strategies in this respect. It was certainly the ambition of the L&F CRP to produce syntheses and big-picture analyses. As specific research lines now mature, more emphasis will be given to syntheses. Only limited capacity was available to undertake big-picture analysis under L&F, but this has been prioritized as components under the phase 2 Fish and Livestock CRPs.
| c) Producing more interdisciplinary publications is certainly an expected output of the value chain teams and their interaction with the other flagship teams, but has been modest to date, related in part to the finding that the value chain teams have been insufficiently staffed. Strengthening site teams under the phase 2 CRPs will improve this situation.
| d) The CRP relies on each centre’s existing
human resource and capacity development policies and programs to ensure mentoring for young scientists. We agree that there may be a role for the CRP to also enable such mentoring by strengthening the role of Communities of Practice across the CRP.